

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, and 8-20 were pending before the Office. Of these, claims 1 and 10 were the only independent claims. The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6, and 8-20.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

No claims are hereby added, amended, canceled, or withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,894,708 to *Watari* (hereinafter "*Watari*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,347 to *Bunton et al.* (hereinafter "*Bunton*"). For at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed in more detail below, the Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of *Watari* and *Bunton* fails to teach or suggest every claim feature.

Claim 1 of the present application recites, inter alia:

if the test result is unsuccessful, performing at least one of:

selecting and automatically switching to a remaining one of the plurality of input lines to receive the test signal for the processor using a first selection signal; and

selecting and automatically switching to a remaining one of the plurality of output lines to send the test result from the processor using a second selection signal.

Claim 10 recites, inter alia:

where in the apparatus is adapted to:

...

if the test result is unsuccessful perform at least one of:

selecting and automatically switching to a remaining one of the plurality of input lines to receive the test signal for the processor using a first selection signal; and

selecting and automatically switching to a remaining one of a plurality of output lines to send the test result from the processor using a second selection signal.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action expressly concedes *Watari* "does not teach" the above-recited features of the present application. Office Action, pages 3-4, lines 17-3. With regard to claim 10, the Office Action apparently concedes the same. Office Action, page 8, lines 5-12. Instead, the Office Action cites *Bunton*.

Bunton is directed to a high-speed interconnection link having automated lane reordering. This high-speed interconnection link is applicable in networking environments such as local area networks (LANs), wide area networks (WANs) and storage area networks (SANs). *Bunton*, col. 1, lines 17-20. The cited sections of *Bunton* discuss Infiniband links. As noted in *Bunton*:

The Infiniband(SM) Trade Association is an independent industry body that is developing a channel-based, switched-network-topology interconnect standard. This standard will decouple the I/O subsystem from the microprocessor-memory complex by using I/O engines referred to as channels. These channels implement switched, point to point serial connections rather than the shared, load and store architecture used in parallel bus PCI connections.

The Infiniband interconnect standard offers several advantages. First, it uses a differential pair of serial signal carriers,

which drastically reduces conductor count. Second, it has a switched topology that permits many more nodes which can be placed farther apart than a parallel bus. Since more nodes can be added, the interconnect network becomes more scalable than the parallel bus network. Furthermore, as new devices are added, the links connecting devices will fully support additional bandwidth. This Infiniband architecture will let network managers buy network systems in pieces, linking components together using long serial cables. As demands grow, the system can grow with those needs.

Col. 2, lines 27-35. Thus, in contrast to the above-recited features, *Bunton* appears to discuss channels in network environments, and not processor test lines. Thus, the proposed combination of *Watari* and *Bunton* cannot properly be relied upon for teaching or suggesting every feature of independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watari* in view of *Bunton* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,782 to *Bombai et al.* (hereinafter "*Bombai*"). For at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 19, the Office Action states: "Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as per claim 9." *Office Action*, page 10, line 10. Regarding claim 9, the Office Action states: "*Watari/Bunton* teaches substantially all the limitations in claim 8." *Office Action*, page 8, lines 17-18. However, as discussed above, the rejection of claims 1 and 10, from which claims 9 and 19 ultimately depend, is deficient. The Applicants respectfully submit that *Bombai* is not alleged to make up for these deficiencies. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 9 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watari* in view of *Bunton* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208713 by *Evans* (hereinafter "*Evans*"). For at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 11-18 and 20, the Office Action appears in substance to take the position that *Watari* and *Bunton* teach the features of independent claim 10, from which each of the rejected claims ultimately depend. However, as discussed above, the rejection of claim 10 is deficient. The Applicants respectfully submit that *Evans* is not alleged to make up for these deficiencies. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 11-18 and 20 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Since the Applicants assert that all the independent claims as amended are in condition for allowance and all remaining claims properly depend from the independent claims, Applicants assert that all claims are allowable.

Applicants do not believe any fees are due regarding this Amendment. However, if any additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

Respectfully Submitted,



Steven M. Santisi
Registration No. 40,157
Dugan & Dugan, PC
Attorneys for Applicants
(914) 332-9081

Dated: October 9, 2007
Tarrytown, New York